

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Rod <Amis@infoserver.fcc.gov>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Fri, Feb 5, 1999 6:07 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Rod (Amis) writes:

Mr. Kennard,

Let me join the chorus of voices from AOL to most ISPs in saying the AT&T should not be given "ownership" of the Internet by forcing its cable customers to use @home. It's a horrible service, that most people who subscribe to don't find satisfying. If AT&T has its way the dynamic of the Internet will be irrevocably damaged.

Regards,
Rod Amis
<http://www.itmanagersjournal.com>

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.86.133.198
Remote IP address: 209.86.133.198

98-146
RECEIVED

FEB 25 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

March 1, 1999 2
FILE

From: Rick Dahlgren <rd@cottonwood.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Fri, Feb 5, 1999 12:35 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

FEB 25 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

98-146

Rick Dahlgren (rd@cottonwood.com) writes:

U S West Hypocrisy
February 5, 1999

U S West's Alliance With OpenNet Screams Of Hypocrisy

On Wednesday, U S West joined OpenNet in seeking government support to force cable companies to open their high speed data networks to competitors. In Omaha, Nebraska, Cottonwood Communications is and has been litigating against U S West since 1994 to obtain access to U S West TeleChoice and U S West TeleChoice OnLine, a U S West Communications cable TV and cable modem internet service passing 50,000 households in West Omaha.

"It's refreshing to read that Sol Trujillo agrees with us," said Cottonwood Vice President Rick Dahlgren, who went on to say, "Too bad U S West is arguing in the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals that we're wrong while standing in front of the national media claiming that networks like U S West TeleChoice need to be open. U S West needs to walk the walk before talking the talk. The hypocrisy is beyond me."

Cottonwood's litigation includes discrimination under the Communications Act and violations of Federal Antitrust Laws. It is currently before the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals in St. Louis.

For more information, contact:

Rick Dahlgren
Phone: (402) 896-2303
FAX: (402) 896-0268
e-mail: rd@cottonwood.com

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 24.4.252.208
Remote IP address: 24.4.252.208

98-146 2

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Steven Robert Pye <bob@pyesr.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Wed, Feb 3, 1999 9:59 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

98-146

Steven Robert Pye (bob@pyesr.com) writes:

docket number 98-146

I would like to add my voice to those asking that high-speed internet access from cable modems, DSL, and other technologies be UNBUNDLED from the ISP service. Please, we need a world where the networks are kept separate from the content suppliers. Network management should be a profitable service separate from content.

Thank you

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.214.88.134
Remote IP address: 209.214.88.134

RECEIVED

FEB 25 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E _____

From: Ronald D. Watkins <rwatkins@zapcom.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Mon, Feb 8, 1999 7:17 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

FEB 25 1999

98-146

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Ronald D. Watkins (rwatkins@zapcom.net) writes:

in reference to docket number 98-146:

It's my opinion that the high speed lines absolutely must be opened to other providers. It strikes me that the wire itself and the provider of services must be treated as two separate things. Eventually, high-speed internet access will be as important, if not more important, than telephone access. Imagine how much hurt could be done to the consumer by a cable company that refuses to allow access to, say, the web sites of its competitors?

The advent of networking and service companies rolled into one is a very new thing, and it strikes me that we need to keep the playing field as open and level as possible. There is a lot of fear of Microsoft dominating the net, but I fear @Home a lot more. When they figure out that there are advantages to making access to search engines they don't own (other than Excite), rather, er, "difficult", the consumer will be hurt.

In essence, it's a bit like having phone companies that are also in the business of, say, selling shoes. If Pacific Bell (my phone company) wanted to be sure I bought their flavor of shoes, they'd make it difficult or impossible for me to look up or call the numbers of competitors.

Eventually, bandwidth is going to be so crucial that it seems to me that it will be important to limit bandwidth companies to being STRICTLY bandwidth companies. We cannot allow them to give particular services preferential treatment -- but what exactly constitutes preferential treatment is a very good question.

I know this is a terribly complex issue. I'd suggest that perhaps you start a (small?) mailing list to try to get some outside input. There's a lot of bright people out here in cyberspace -- tap the brains of some of us who are in the middle of it. :-)

Thank you,

Ron Watkins
San Ramon, CA
(925) 560-9588

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 207.105.212.216
Remote IP address: 207.105.212.216

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

2

From: Nelson L. Allen <nallen@seidata.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Sun, Feb 7, 1999 11:08 AM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-146

Nelson L. Allen (nallen@seidata.com) writes:

Sir:

I would like to encourage you to support the mandatory upgrade of all existing telephone systems to be able to handle internet communications at the 56k level. Also any new systems to be installed should also be required to handle information at the same level.

I believe that the companies now responsible will not do this unless required because they see the ability to communicate at these speeds as a new marketable commodity. This has encouraged them to downgrade existing systems so that they may profit from forcing the general public to buy much more expensive ISDN service. I am fully aware that any company should be able to capitalize on new market areas but at the expense of the general public should not be one of them. Internet communications in rural areas can substitute for libraries, cultural exposure, and the vast world outside the small town environment. These citizens can hardly afford ISDN services and should not be taken advantage of by these large corporations. At the same time the residents of large metropolitan areas, not to mention the handicapped, could better access the world from home. If these services have to be provided in conventional ways it will be at far greater cost than by mandating minimum 56K sta!

ndards. The citizens of all are

as and abilities have the right to full access of communication without being held up by the telephone companies. While business may require higher and higher communication levels, and should rightly pay for those services, the general public has a right to at least minimal communications at present rates. I know of at least one situation where Sprint has reduced service from 56K to 28K and then tried to sell ISDN service to individual. This is the type of strong arm tactics these companies will do if allowed to carry on freely.

Please support efforts and lead the way to saving all of us money and better education.

Thank you,

Nelson L. Allen

186 Scotts Ridge Rd.

Rising Sun, Indiana 47040

nallen@seidata.com

RECEIVED

FEB 25 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 208.10.211.234
Remote IP address: 208.10.211.234

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E _____

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Douglas H Bennett <douglas@iastate.edu>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(WKENNARD)
Date: Sat, Feb 6, 1999 3:06 PM
Subject: Bandwidth "Last Mile" issue

98-146

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am deeply disturbed by the the reports I hear of the cable and phone companies looking to force me (as an individual consumer) to use an INternet Service Provider (ISP) that they choose. In other words, when I get a high bandwidth connection in my home, I will not have the option to choose which company I want to do business with as an Internet Service Provider - or at most I'll be able to choose between the telephone company or the cable company. I frankly do not like this scenario.

I ask that you ensure that consumers will have open options and that you will encourage free and open competition among the ISP's. If you have to, force the telephone and cable companies to allow us to choose the ISP we want to use in out home.

Thank you for your time,

Doug Bennett
1909 Greene Street
Boone, IA 50036

RECEIVED

FEB 25 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

From: Monty Bond <MWBond@Sprynet.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Sat, Feb 6, 1999 12:47 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

FEB 25 1999

98-146

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Monty Bond (MWBond@Sprynet.com) writes:

I have heard that the telephone companies and Cable companies want to take exclusive control of a concept called broadband access to the net.

Whatever it is called, it would mean that the Telephone companies or the Cable companies will have exclusive control over the Internet. They will then decide what ISP that we can use.

This is Wrong Wrong wrong.

But I know the FCC. The only thing they listen to is Legal action.

So be it.

Let this be a warning. If this law passes (It seems to have your support) And IF the Cable companies and Phone companies gain exclusive access and limit our ability to choose ISP's and if we have to pay the Phone or Cable company to let us have access to the ISP then

A Legal Warning

I will sue the FCC and the Phone/Cable companies if this happens..

This is not a consider taking legal action... This is a Difinate YES.

All you have to do now is say we do not approve and get Congress to vote this stupid law down... No one should have the say so to tell us which ISP we want to use. No one should make us pay twice for Internet access...

Notice there is a way out of this legal action... IF the law fails and the Phone/Cable companies do not gain this exclusive right and that things stay the same as they were before...

I am waiting on finding out how the law goes... I believe our biggest champion against this FCC stupidity is Bill Clinton I think he said he would veto the law anyway...

Monty Bond

You have been warned

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.154.86.32
Remote IP address: 209.154.86.32

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

2

From: Ed Jones <ejones@columbus.rr.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Sat, Feb 6, 1999 11:26 AM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-146

Ed Jones (ejones@columbus.rr.com) writes:

Docket number 98-146

Mr Kennard, I am writing to ask that the FCC open up the cable television lines to allow other ISPs to provide internet service to the public. I am a current subscriber to Time Warner's RoadRunner cable modem service. The 'service' from Time Warner is awful. If there were any other provider of high-bandwidth internet connectivity in Central Ohio, I would leave Time Warner in an instant. When the RoadRunner service is working, the bandwidth available to the customer is very nice. But, Time Warner, as an ISP, is totally incapable of providing a stable service for its customers. It would be a great service to the public to have access to other service providers across the cable lines. Not only would prices drop, but these competing companies would force Time Warner to provide a better service.

Thanks,
Ed Jones

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 198.133.30.23
Remote IP address: 198.133.30.23

RECEIVED

FEB 25 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

✓
From: James Frank Chambers <bwdude@pacificnet.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Wed, Feb 3, 1999 12:29 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

98-146

James Frank Chambers (bwdude@pacificnet.net) writes:

Re: docket number 98-146. I would hate to see the independent ISP's excluded from offering their services over the cable network. I am completely turned off by Microsoft anti-competitive actions and I don't really think that I could expect the cable monopoly organizations to exhibit better behavior. Let's not stamp out the independent ISP's (Internet Service Providers.)

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 207.171.35.34
Remote IP address: 207.171.35.34

RECEIVED

FEB 25 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E